DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 485 EC 093 206

AUTHOR	Ramsay, James G.
TITLE	DSEPPS Supplementary Reading Program for Handicapped Children 1975-76. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[76]
NOTE	50p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Diagnostic Teaching; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Remedial Reading; *Research Design; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Reported is the evaluation of the Division of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services (DSEPPS) 1975-76 Supplementary Reading Program for Handicapped Children which operated in 43 schools in New York City and served 1,578 children (5-16 years old) through two agencies--the Bureau for the Education of the Physically Handicapped (BEPH) and the Bureau for Children of Retarded Mental Development (CRMD). The reading program is noted to have employed a repeating sequence of diagnosis, prescription, remediation, and evaluation. Among the evaluation objectives listed were statistically significant improvement of Ss in their reading grade level and mastery of eight previously failed instructional objectives in reading. Findings are reported in terms of evaluation objectives, field evaluation check list, discrepancy analysis, and recommendations from the prior year's evaluation. It is concluded that the DSEPPS Reading Program did produce statistically significant improvement in children's reading level; that it was not demonstrated that 70% of any of the groups of children were able to master eight or more instructional objectives from the California Prescriptive Reading Inventory; that for the majority of children, participation in the program resulted in the mastery of instructional objectives which were failed on the pre-test; and that the program coincided with the project proposal. Tables with statistical data are provided; and appended materials are given which include a sample information report form, a data loss form, and a program abstract. (SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136485

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-69605B

DSEPPS SUPPLEMENTARY READING PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN 1975-76

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Prepared by: James G. Ramsay, Ph.D.

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Pl 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-76 school year.

2

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

EC093206

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: The Program 1

CHAPTER II: Evaluative Procedures 2

CHAPTER III: Findings 4

CHAPTER IV: Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations 15

APPENDICES:

Appendix A: SED MIR Form, Section II 18

Appendix B: Data Loss Form 32

Appendix C: Program Abstract 33

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Distribution of the Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction 6

Table 2: Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objective as a Result of Instruction 7

CHAPTER I: THE PROGRAM

This report is an evaluation of the Division of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services (DSEPPS) Supplementary Reading Program for Handicapped Children, 1975-76. The evaluation is specifically concerned with two subsets of children in the program: (1) children serviced by the Bureau for the Education of the Physically Handicapped (BEPH) and (2) children serviced by the Bureau for Children of Retarded Mental Development (CRMD).

The DSEPPS Reading Program was operated in a total of 43 schools located in the five boroughs of New York City. Eighteen of the sites serviced BEPH children; 25 of the sites serviced CRMD children. There were 18½ teachers (one teacher worked a half-time schedule) and one paraprofessional connected with the BEPH sites and 20 teachers and one paraprofessional connected with the CRMD sites. Some of the teachers worked split schedules, teaching at two different sites during the week. There were 762 BEPH children in the program and 816 CRMD children. The children were from five to sixteen years old. Children were selected to participate in the program on the basis of standardized diagnostic reading test scores in the children's permanent files. The DSEPPS teachers and the children's regular teachers evaluated these scores and jointly decided which children would be benefited most by the program.

As a result of participation in the program it was expected that the children's reading ability would improve as measured by the Stanford Reading Achievement Test and the California Prescriptive Reading Inventory. The pedagogical methodology employed by the teachers followed a repeating sequence of Diagnosis, Prescription, Remediation, Evaluation. The specific techniques of reading instruction varied from teacher to

teacher, but in each case were characterized by small group and one-on-one instruction, a variety of materials suitable for children with limited attention spans, and small step reinforcement procedures designed to guarantee each child with success experiences regardless of the child's actual level of performance. The DSEPPS Readin' Program operated from September 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976.

CHAPTER II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The evaluation objectives of the program, as stated in the Evaluation Design* were

> #1: To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, handicapped pupils achieve a statistically significant improvement in their reading grade level.
>
> #2: To determine if 70 percent of the pupils master eight instructional objectives in reading which they failed to master prior to participation in the program.
>
> #3: To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.
>
> #4: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

The evaluation instrument used for Evaluation Objective #1 was the Stanford Reading Achievement Test (Primary I level. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1974). Form B of the test was used for the pretest and and Form A for the posttest. The test is norm-referenced with scores given in grade equivalents. The instrument used for Evaluation Objectives

---

*Roth, Wm. Evaluation Design: The DSEPPS Supplementary Reading Program for the Handicapped. B/E # 09-69605, Office of Educational Evaluation, August, 1975, pp. 2-4.

#2 and #3 was the California Prescriptive Reading Inventory (Red, Green and Blue levels. Monterey, California: McGraw-Hill, 1972). A small group of 13 children in the CRMD group who were complete non-readers were given the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test (Level II, Form P. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976). These scores were evaluated separately under Evaluation Objective #1. Information collected during the site visits was used to evaluate Evaluation Objective #4.

No random sampling procedures were used in the collection of the data since an attempt was made to test every child in the program. The data was broken into two subsets based on the children's participation in either the BEPH or the CRMD component. Each of these groups was further divided into children whose Stanford Reading Achievement (SRAT) pretest scores were obtained in May, 1975 and children whose pretest scores were obtained in November, 1975. The SRAT posttest was administered in May, 1976 and the data were collected at the beginning of June, 1976. The Prescriptive Reading Inventory (PRI) pretest was administered in November, 1976, and the posttest was administered in May, 1976 with the data collected in early June, 1976. PRI interim tests were given periodically to enable the DSEPPS teachers to be accurate in their diagnosis-prescription-remediation-evaluation cycle. The Metropolitan Readiness Test was administered in November, 1975 and again in May, 1976.

A *t* test for correlated samples was used for the SRAT and Metropolitan Readiness test data to evaluate statistically the effect of participation in the program. A *t* test was computed for pretest-posttest SRAT scores for the Nov. '75 - May '76 group and for the May '75 - May '76 group in the BEPH component and for the same two groups in the CRMD component. A fifth *t* test was computed for the Metropolitan Readiness Test data.

The PRI data were subjected to frequency counts of (1) number of children initially mastering a given objective, (2) number of children failing the objective, (3) number of children mastering an objective which they had previously failed, (4) number of children who failed an objective which they had previously failed, and (5) number of objectives ultimately mastered by each child.

While no limitation was imposed on the evaluation procedure by late funding, the pretesting for children with no May '75 scores was moved up from October to November, 1975 because of a city-wide teachers' strike. The strike disrupted scheduling to the extent that November was the earliest point at which the pretest could be administered.

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS

The findings in this chapter are separated into the following sections: Evaluation Objectives, Field Evaluation Check List, Discrepancy Analysis, Recommendations from Prior Year's Evaluation.

Evaluation Objectives

> Evaluation Objective #1: To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, handicapped pupils achieve a statistically significant improvement in their reading grade level.*

The results of the *t* tests computed from the SRAT data and the Metropolitan Readiness Test data are presented in Appendix A, Table 11 of the State Education Department (SED) Mailed Information Report (MIR). From the *t* tests it was determined that the two BEPH groups (SED code 6086146) showed a statistically significant gain in mean reading grade

---

*Roth, Wm. Ibid.

level on the SRAT ($p < .01$). The t tests for the two main CRMD groups (SED code 6086142) on the SRAT data were also statistically significant ($p \leq .01$). While the small group of absolute non-readers in the CRMD group given the Metropolitan Readiness Test did show an increase in mean reading scores from pretest to posttest, the mean difference was not statistically significant.

The pedagogical methodology employed to achieve Evaluation Objective #1 consisted of (1) small group instruction where DSEPPS teachers met with groups of approximately four children for four sessions per week, with each session lasting approximately 45 minutes; (2) extensive lesson preparation by the teachers designed to address each child's specific reading problems; (3) a variety of materials which allowed a teacher to provide multi-sensory learning experiences and to switch materials if a child's attention to one set of material became exhausted; (4) a reinforcement system that focussed on each child's successes; and (5) regular conferences between the DSEPPS teacher and the children's regular teacher which provided a coordinated effort in dealing with each child's reading deficits.

> Evaluation Objective #2: To determine if 70 percent of the pupils master eight instructional objectives in reading which they failed to master prior to participation in the program.*

The results of the distributions compiled from the PRI data are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Tables 1 and 2 are organized so that data from the BEPH Group and data from the CRMD group are presented separately; within each group, data are also presented separately for each level of the PRI - Red, Green,

---

*Roth, Wm. Ibid.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION

No. of Instr. Objectives Mastered	BEPH Group						CRMD Group					
	Red		Green		Blue		Red		Green		Blue	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	100	22	18	11	5	6	126	17	2	7	0	0
1	25	5	9	6	1	1	27	4	1	3	0	0
2	35	8	7	5	2	2	39	5	2	7	0	0
3	24	5	7	5	7	8	61	8	1	3	0	0
4	39	8	12	7	2	2	61	8	1	3	0	0
5	53	12	15	9	7	8	85	12	2	7	0	0
6	50	11	20	12	13	16	86	12	5	17	1	20
7	32	7	15	9	9	11	95	13	4	15	1	20
8+	102	22	58	36	39	46	150	21	11	38	3	60
TOTALS	460	100	161	100	85	100	730	100	29	100	5	100

and Blue.

The findings presented in Table 1 are relevant to Evaluation Objective #1. A given N in Table 1 represents the number of children in a particular group (BEPH or CRMD) who took a particular level of the PRI posttest (Red, Green, or Blue) and who mastered the number of objectives indicated in the first column of Table 1 which they failed to master on the pretest. A given percent in Table 1 represents an N described above divided by the total number of children in a particular group (BEPH or CRMD) who took a particular level of the PRI posttest, multiplied by 100.

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

SED Code	BEPH Group						CRMD Group					
	Red		Green		Blue		Red		Green		Blue	
	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%
2101	193/384	50	101/128	79			276/547	50	19/29	66		
2102	198/349	57	47/58	81			314/567	55	7/10	70		
2104	148/311	48					268/551	49				
2105	131/297	44					300/533	56				
2106			67/88	76					8/18	44		
2107					34/40	85					4/4	100
2108			20/28	71	27/32	84			1/5	20	3/3	100
2109			49/57	86	22/25	88			8/14	57	3/3	100
2110			45/59	76					12/16	75		
2201	55/107	51			12/13	92	169/312	54			1/1	100
2202	66/172	38	53/76	70			96/239	40	3/9	34		
2203			30/56	54					5/8	63		
2204	107/165	65	18/25	72	27/41	66	158/396	40	8/9	89	0/1	0
2205	98/166	59	39/51	76			215/408	53	11/15	73		
2206	91/212	55					77/292	26				
2207	46/85	54			41/56	73	34/111	31			2/2	100
2208					8/16	50					1/1	100
2301	14/28	50			17/19	89	42/81	52			1/1	100
2302			3/4	75					1/2	50		
2303	15/24	63	6/7	86	13/13	100	5/14	36	4/6	67	1/1	100
2304	24/48	50	1/1	100	20/23	87	88/128	69	6/9	67	0/0	0

Table 2 continued

SED Code	BEPH Group						CRMD Group					
	Red		Green		Blue		Red		Green		Blue	
	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%
2305	28/69	41	30/37	81	31/37	84	89/189	47	10/10	100	4/4	100
2401	13/45	29	1/4	25	3/5	60	21/50	42	4/9	44	3/3	100
2403	22/63	35	26/48	54	22/35	63	38/82	46	2/6	34	4/5	80
2404	79/235	34	30/73	41	35/50	70	80/169	47	5/8	63	1/1	100
2406	32/136	24	41/97	42	31/55	56	53/145	37	9/13	69	3/3	100
2408	33/85	39	10/24	42	14/38	37	39/86	45	3/5	60	3/3	100
2409	103/321	32	46/91	51	41/61	67	130/229	57	7/15	47	2/5	40
2410					1/3	34					0/0	0
2411					0/3	0					0/0	0
2412	36/74	49	28/48	58	18/37	49	68/195	35	10/17	59	1/1	100
2413			0/0	0	6/6	100			0/0	0	0/0	0
2414					3/7	43					0/0	0

As may be observed from Table 1, reading across the percentages associated with the mastery of eight (or more) instructional objectives, none of the groups had 70 percent of their number who passed eight objectives. That is, the instructional goal implicit in Evaluation Objective #2 was not achieved.

The pedagogical methodology used in attempting to achieve Evaluation Objective #2 involved the use of the PRI pretest and the interim tests as diagnostic instruments and, subsequently, teaching specifically for the

objectives which were not mastered.

> Evaluation Objective #3: To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of the instructional objectives.*

The data presented in Table 2 are relevant to Evaluation Objective #3. The instructional objectives listed in the first column of Table 2 are presented according to the State Education Department format. A given ratio in Table 2 represents the number of children in a group defined by the column headings who mastered the associated SED objective on the post-test, divided by the number of children in that group who attempted mastery. Each ratio is expressed as a percentage in the column directly to the right of the given ratio. Inspection of Table 2 indicates that for the majority of instructional objectives, the percentage of mastery after instruction averaged about 60%, but varied from 0 percent to 100 percent. The pedagogical methodology used to promote mastery of the instructional objectives was the same as described for Evaluation Objective #2.

> Evaluation Objective #4: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the project proposal.*

During the course of the school year, every school which served as a program site was visited by the evaluator, and follow-up visits were made to some schools. These site visits were distributed throughout the school year, with the greatest number occurring from November, '75 - January, '76 and from March, '76 - May, '76.

Field Evaluation Check-list

The following description is based on a compilation of interview responses and evaluator observations and is organized according to

---

*Roth, Wm. Ibid.

selected items from the Field Evaluation Check-list provided by the Office of Educational Evaluation.

Student attendence and motivation. While attendence and motivation were considered a problem, the great majority of the DSEPPS teachers said that attendence increased as children became involved in the program, and, concurrently, motivation to succeed increased. Several teachers indicated that their children were emotionally upset by being tested, and that absences were frequently the result of the children's fear of being tested.

Degree to which actual classroom activities conformed with activities delineated in the program proposal. The observed classroom activities did conform to activities described in the program proposal. The activities were varied, involved the presentation of multi-sensory information, and were designed to connect to pre-determined reading objectives.

Relationship between class size and perceived program effectiveness. The DSEPPS teachers were unanimous in their perceptions that the single most effective factor in the program was the small group size. The teachers indicated that small group instruction was a prerequisite to success because of the limited attention span and emotional volatility of the children.

Evaluator's perceptions of instructional staff morale. The great majority of the DSEPPS teachers indicated they were pleased with the program and that their morale was high. They attributed this to good relations with the regular teaching and administrative staff of the school, to their experience of success with their children, and to the effective administration of the program. Those teachers who were less positive tended to indicate that too much of their time and their students' time was taken up by testing procedures.

Inservice staff training for professional staff and staff perceptions of ongoing staff training by program coordinator and by persons other than the program coordinator. The program coordinator conducted regular staff training sessions and also arranged with the Special Education Instructional Materials Center (SEIMC) a series of four special training sessions conducted by SEIMC personnel in every borough of New York City. In addition, special training sessions were held in which a team of DSEPPS teachers was videotaped during exemplary teaching sessions. These tapes were then used as instructional devices during inservice training sessions. Finally, two committees of teachers were formed, one of which devised procedures for the use of video taping in the classroom while the other organized a field source book for teachers.

Materials: arrival, quality and quantity. The most frequent complaint of the DSSEPS teachers was that the materials they ordered were late in arriving. In spite of these difficulties, the evaluator was impressed with the variety and quality of the materials the teachers had assembled and incorporated into the program. A great variety of teacher-made materials were used, and the creativity the teachers exhibited was remarkable. One example of note was a "book" produced by a team of DSEPPS teachers, made up of writings, experiments and observations of children in the program, interspersed with xeroxed reproductions of photographs of the children. The humor and intelligence used in the creation of this book, and the fact that it put the children's own thoughts, comments, observations and photographs into print, made it an excellent teaching device as well as a product of their learning which the children could keep. Other materials involved teacher-made games, audio-visual materials such as tape recorder with accompanying films or film

strips, books, paper construction materials, three dimensional letters to be used tactilely, workbooks, reinforcement materials such as token systems and progress charts, and writing and drawing materials.

The attractiveness, spaciousness and suitability of the physical plant. The majority of the teachers had been provided with adequate space. In a few cases, DSEPPS teachers had been relegated to spaces which were too small or too public, but these teachers were able to move to larger or more suitable spaces as they became available. In every case the teachers and their students had made the environment attractive and interesting through the display of the children's work and with pictures and teaching devices which had aesthetic as well as educational appeal.

Discrepancy Analysis

The program, as implemented, was found to coincide with the program as described in the proposal. The single discrepancy which was observed related to the turnover of children in the program and would seem to be an unavoidable problem associated with such programs. It is assumed, in the proposal, that a given number of children will be serviced at a particular school. However, owing to the turnover rate, children identified at the beginning of the year may not finish out the school year. If a child is transferred, a new child may take his or her place in the program. Thus, while the total number of children being serviced at a particular school remains constant, the actual identities of some of the children may change, and the continuity of service for the children who were transferred and the children who replaced them is disrupted. It is important to understand, however, that the turnover rate of children in the program is no larger than the turnover rate of children in the New York City public schools in general. This is why the problem seems unavoidable.

The program is servicing the needs of BEPH and CRMD children from 5 to 16 years of age who were identified through diagnostic tests by the cooperative judgment of tax-levy and DSEPPS teachers as needing the program.

Recommendations from Prior Year's Report*

1. The central office should ensure that the receiving school cooperate with the program teacher and teacher trainer in providing supplementary reading and math instruction.

The recommendation was implemented in this year's program through conferences held at the beginning of the year for the DSEPPS teachers, their supervisors, and the superintendents and/or principals of the receiving school. Many problems were avoided because of the information exchanged at these conferences.

2. The program should reduce the number of schools each trainer is responsible for covering.

Budget cuts in this year's program eliminated the positions of teacher trainers. The recommendation is not applicable to this year's program.

3. It is recommended that the program develop clear selection criteria for hiring supplementary reading and math teachers.

The recommendation was implemented in this year's program. Every teacher in the program was a licensed, special education teacher. Several were, in addition, guidance counselors.

4. Although there was a very intense 2-week orientation period at the beginning of the school year for program teachers, there was no systematic program of inservice education during the remaining school year.

This year's program had a variety of inservice training sessions through-

---

*Siperstein, G.N. Evaluation Report: Supplementary Reading and Mathematics Instructional Skills Program for Handicapped Children. B/E Function # 09-59605 (c), Office of Educational Evaluation, 1975, pp. 38-42.

out the school year, centering on materials, techniques, and even the use of video tape. The recommendation was implemented.

> 5. It is recommended that teacher trainers meet on a regular basis with their program teachers.

The recommendation is not applicable to this year's program for the reason given in response to Recommendation #2 above.

> 6. It is recommended that at the beginning of the year, preferably during the initial orientation session, the program provide teachers with a curriculum package which would include an assortment of reading and math materials and diagnostic instruments.

The recommendation was not implemented for the following reasons: (1) the great majority of the teachers, because they were licensed in the area of special education, brought to the program their own materials. (2) The diagnostic instruments were provided some time after the program was underway. (3) The teachers ordered their own curriculum package, appropriate for the children they were dealing with at the beginning of the year, but the materials tended to be late in arrival.

> 7. It is recommended that teachers be screened in the beginning of the year according to their preference and desire to work alone or with a peer.

Because of this year's budget crisis, it was impossible to distribute pairs of teachers in most of the receiving schools. The recommendation is a reasonable one, but could not be implemented because of the fiscal limitations of this year's program.

> 8. It is recommended that a smaller number of junior high students be assigned to each supplementary reading and math teacher.

Again, because of budget limitations, the number of students assigned to each teacher could not be varied. However, care was taken to assign teachers most capable of handling potentially violent situations to classes

of older children and, to this extent, the recommendation was taken into consideration.

> 9. It is recommended that students at the junior high school level be selected for participation in the program during the early part of the seventh grade.

The recommendation is not applicable to this year's program since the children selected to participate are classified as ungraded.

In the discussion of the prior year's recommendations, it has been assumed that the reader understands that this year's program was limited to the teaching of reading, so that any reference to mathematics instruction in last year's recommendations is not applicable to this year's program.

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Information relevant to each section of this chapter -- summary of major findings, conclusions, and recommendations -- is presented separately.

Summary of Major Findings

The SRAT test data were analysed separately depending upon (1) bureau servicing the child - BEPH or CRMD, and (2) date the pretest was given - 5/75 or 11/75. A separate analysis was performed on 13 children given the MRRT. Each of the four t tests for correlated samples performed on the SRAT data indicated highly statistically significant increases in mean reading achievement ($p \leq .01$). The t test for correlated samples performed on the MRRT data was not statistically significant at the .05 level. These results are presented in Appendix A.

The PRI data were separated into distributions depending upon (1) bureau servicing the child - BEPH or CRMD and (2) level of the PRI - Red, Green or Blue. These data are presented in Table 1. There were no

distributions in which 70 percent of the group of children under consideration mastered eight or more instructional objectives. A separate analysis of the PRI data was performed to determine the extent to which children mastered instructional objectives which they had failed to master on the PRI pretest. These data, presented separately for the BEPH and CRMD groups, for the level of the test (Red, Green, or Blue), and for each different SED instructional objective, may be inspected in Table 2.

The major findings of the site visits were: (1) small group size was the single most effective element of the program; (2) inservice training was extensive and effective; (3) materials which were ordered were frequently late in arrival, but the creativity the DSEPPS teachers showed in assembling and creating materials was exemplary and the material used were of a remarkable variety and quality; (4) the physical environments the program operated in were, in general, suitable, spacious and attractive; and (5) the good relationship between DSEPPS teachers and the regular school staff was a morale builder to the DSEPPS teachers.

Conclusions

In light of the evaluation objectives, it may be concluded that (1) the DSEPPS Reading Program did produce statistically significant improvement in the reading level of the children involved as measured by the SRAT; (2) it was not demonstrated that 70 percent of any of the groups of children were able to master eight or more instructional objectives on the PRI; (3) for the majority of children participation in the program resulted in the mastery of instructional objectives which were failed on the pretest; and (4) the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this evaluation report, it is recommended that the DSEPPS Supplementary Reading Program for the Handicapped be continued. It is obvious that brain injured, mentally retarded, and physically handicapped children have very special educational needs. Fundamental to their education is ability in reading. The statistical evidence presented in the present evaluation indicates that the DSEPPS Reading Program increases that ability. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that these children can master instructional objectives in reading as a result of prescribed instruction. Finally, because of their limited attention spans and tendencies to act out, brain injured, mentally retarded and physically handicapped children function best in an educational setting where one child or a small group of children works with a trained, interested, empathetic adult. The DSEPPS Program provides for such small group instruction and also provides highly qualified personnel to teach the children.

As a result of the present evaluation, the following recommendations can be made to improve the DSEPPS Reading Program for next year's operation:

(1) Before the program begins next year, care should be taken to assure the speedy delivery of materials ordered by the teachers.

(2) Tests other than the SRAT and the PRI should be considered for use in evaluating the performance of the children. The SRAT and the PRI were developed for normal children. Teachers connected their children's absences with the extensive testing program. Perhaps shortened versions of the tests could be used.

(3) The quality of the teachers in the program should be maintained by the stipulation that DSEPPS teachers be licensed teachers with training in special education.

APPENDIX A

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

Due Date: July 1, 1976

SED Project Number: | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 6 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 5 | B

Project Title The DSEIS Supplementary Reading Program for the Handicapped, 1975-76

School District Name New York City - DSEIS - 75

School District Address 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name James C. Ramsay, Ph.D.

Title Consultant-Evaluator

Telephone Number 212 (Area Code) 533-3365

Date this form was completed 6 / 12 / 76.

Table 11 Norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 9.

DSEPPS Supplementary Reading Program for the Handicapped, 1975-76
Function # 09-69605

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	N 4/	Score Type 5/	Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post					Date	Mean	6/ S.D.	Date	Mean	6/ S.D.	7/ Test	8/ Value
6 0 8 6 1 4 2 7 2 0	"	SRAT '74	B	A	Pri 1	Pri 1	431	61	314	1	5/75	1.21	.83	5/76	1.73	.97	t	16.28**
"	"	"	"	"	"	"	372	"	303	"	11/75	.95	.76	5/76	1.54	.86	"	19.63**
"	"	MRRT '76	P	P	2	2	13	"	13	2	11/75	.39	.44	5/76	.75	.46	"	.09
6 0 8 6 1 4 6	"	SRAT '74	B	A	Pri 1	Pri 1	490	"	377	1	5/75	2.05	1.00	5/76	2.53	1.28	"	12.83**
"	"	"	"	"	"	"	263	"	186	"	11/75	2.16	1.27	5/76	2.87	1.52	"	13.92**

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.
7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).
8/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g. F=13.25

** $p < .01$

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2)	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	Passing	Failing
6 0 8 6 1 4 2	2 1 0 1	Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Red	21	547	276	271
"	2 1 0 2	"	"	37	567	314	253
"	2 1 0 4	"	"	59	551	268	283
"	2 1 0 5	"	"	60	533	300	233
"	2 2 0 1	"	"	65	312	169	143
"	2 2 0 2	"	"	50	239	96	143
"	2 2 0 4	"	"	7	396	158	238
"	2 2 0 5	"	"	43	408	215	193
"	2 2 0 6	"	"	68	292	77	215
"	2 2 0 7	"	"	23	111	34	77
"	2 3 0 1	"	"	47	81	42	39

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6 0 8 6 1 4 2	2 3 0 3	Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Red	52	14	5	9
"	2 3 0 4	"	"	31	128	88	40
"	2 3 0 5	"	"	44	189	89	100
"	2 4 0 1	"	"	25	50	21	29
"	2 4 0 3	"	"	29	82	38	44
"	2 4 0 4	"	"	37	169	80	89
"	2 4 0 6	"	"	18	145	53	92
"	2 4 0 8	"	"	16	86	39	47
"	2 4 0 9	"	"	16	229	130	99
"	2 4 1 2	"	"	36	195	68	127

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2)
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	Passing	Failing
6 0 8 6 1 4 2	2 1 0 1	Presciptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Green	1	29	19	10
"	2 1 0 2	"	"	14	10	7	3
"	2 1 0 6	"	"	6	18	8	10
"	2 1 0 8	"	"	1	5	1	4
	2 1 0 9	"	"	10	14	8	6
"	2 1 1 0	"	"	10	16	12	4
"	2 2 0 2	"	"	8	9	3	6
"	2 2 0 3	"	"	6	8	5	3
"	2 2 0 4	"	"	14	9	8	1
"	2 2 0 5	"	"	12	15	11	4
"	2 3 0 2	"	"	9	2	1	1

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2)
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	Passing	Failing
6 0 8 6 1 4 2	2 3 0 3	Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Green	7	6	4	2
"	2 3 0 4	"	"	4	9	6	3
"	2 3 0 5	"	"	5	10	10	0
"	2 4 0 1	"	"	3	9	4	5
"	2 4 0 3	"	"	4	6	2	4
"	2 4 0 4	"	"	7	8	5	3
"	2 4 0 6	"	"	1	13	9	4
"	2 4 0 8	"	"	4	3	3	0
"	2 4 0 9	"	"	2	15	7	8
"	2 4 1 2	"	"	1	17	10	7
"	2 4 1 3	"	"	4	0	0	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
				No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2)
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	Passing	Failing
6 0 8 6 1 4 2	2 1 0 7	Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Blue	1	4	4	0
"	2 1 0 8	"	"	2	3	3	0
"	2 1 0 9	"	"	2	3	3	0
"	2 2 0 1	"	"	2	1	1	0
"	2 2 0 4	"	"	3	1	0	1
"	2 2 0 7	"	"	4	2	2	0
"	2 2 0 8	"	"	1	1	1	0
"	2 3 0 1	"	"	2	1	1	0
"	2 3 0 3	"	"	1	1	1	0
"	2 3 0 4	"	"	4	0	0	0
"	2 3 0 5	"	"	1	4	4	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 6 1 4 2	2 4 0 1	Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Blue	1	3	3	0
"	2 4 0 3	"	"	0	5	4	1
"	2 4 0 4	"	"	3	1	1	0
"	2 4 0 6	"	"	1	3	3	0
"	2 4 0 8	"	"	1	3	3	0
"	2 4 0 9	"	"	0	5	2	3
"	2 4 1 0	"	"	1	0	0	0
"	2 4 1 1	"	"	1	0	0	0
"	2 4 1 2	"	"	1	1	1	0
"	2 4 1 3	"	"	1	0	0	0
"	2 4 1 4	"	"	0	0	0	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 3 6 1 4 6	2 1 0 1	Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Red	73	384	193	191
"	2 1 0 2	"	"	110	349	198	151
"	2 1 0 4	"	"	141	311	148	163
"	2 1 0 5	"	"	129	297	131	166
"	2 2 0 1	"	"	133	107	55	52
"	2 2 0 2	"	"	101	172	66	106
"	2 2 0 4	"	"	24	165	107	58
"	2 2 0 5	"	"	100	166	98	68
"	2 2 0 6	"	"	136	212	91	121
"	2 2 0 7	"	"	68	85	46	39
"	2 3 0 1	"	"	100	28	14	14

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2)
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	Passing	Failing
60 6 1 46	2 3 0 3	Prescriptive Reading Inventory	Red	92	24	15	9
"	2 3 0 4	(McGraw-Hill) "	"	75	48	24	24
"	2 3 0 5	"	"	85	69	28	41
"	2 4 0 1	"	"	37	45	13	32
"	2 4 0 3	"	"	40	63	22	41
"	2 4 0 4	"	"	58	235	79	156
"	2 4 0 6	"	"	40	136	32	104
"	2 4 0 8	"	"	24	85	33	52
"	2 4 0 9	"	"	37	321	103	218
"	2 4 1 2	"	"	59	74	36	38

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
60896146	2101	Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Green	18	128	101	27
"	2102	"	"	71	58	47	11
"	2106	"	"	46	88	67	21
"	2108	"	"	24	28	20	8
"	2109	"	"	59	57	49	8
"	2110	"	"	42	59	45	14
"	2202	"	"	22	76	53	23
"	2203	"	"	29	56	30	26
"	2204	"	"	62	25	18	7
"	2205	"	"	70	51	39	12
"	2302	"	"	36	4	3	1

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 6 1 4 6	2 3 0 3	Prescriptive Reading Inventory	Green	50	7	6	1
"	2 3 0 4	(McGraw-Hill) "	"	43	1	1	0
"	2 3 0 5	"	"	31	37	30	7
"	2 4 0 1	"	"	24	4	1	3
"	2 4 0 3	"	"	27	48	26	22
"	2 4 0 4	"	"	31	73	30	43
"	2 4 0 6	"	"	6	97	41	56
"	2 4 0 7	"	"	27	24	10	14
"	2 4 0 8	"	"	17	91	46	45
"	2 4 1 2	"	"	21	49	28	20
"	2 4 1 3	"	"	21	0	0	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
5 0 8 6 1 4 6	2 1 0 7	Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw-Hill)	Blue	46	40	34	6
"	2 1 0 9	"	"	40	32	27	5
"	2 1 0 8	"	"	56	25	22	3
"	2 2 0 1	"	"	55	13	12	1
"	2 2 0 4	"	"	31	41	27	14
"	2 2 0 7	"	"	26	56	41	15
"	2 2 0 8	"	"	35	16	8	8
"	2 3 0 1	"	"	25	19	17	2
"	2 3 0 3	"	"	25	13	13	0
"	2 3 0 4	"	"	36	23	20	3
"	2 3 0 5	"	"	37	37	31	6

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
60896146	2401	Prescriptive Reading Inventory	Blue	29	5	3	2
"	2403	(McGraw-Hill) "	"	14	35	22	13
"	2404	"	"	26	50	35	15
"	2406	"	"	7	55	31	24
"	2408	"	"	18	38	14	24
"	2409	"	"	10	61	41	20
"	2410	"	"	10	3	1	2
"	2411	"	"	9	3	0	3
"	2412	"	"	16	37	18	19
"	2413	"	"	14	6	6	0
"	2414	"	"	13	7	3	4

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to NARRATIVE) Function # 09-69605 DSEPPS Supplementary Reading Program for the Handicapped, 1975-76

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between the MIR and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of the MIR should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons Why Students Were Not Tested, Or If Tested, Were Not Analyzed	
						N	%		Number
60861462	720	61	SRAT '74 Har. Brace	431	314	117	27%	(data loss for 5/75 - 5/76 pre-post group)	
								1. Discharged	80
								2. Absent	37
"	"	"	"	372	303	69	19 %	(data loss for 11/75 - 5/76 pre-post group)	
								1. Discharged	29
								2. Absent	40
60861466	720	61	"	490	377	113	23%	(data loss for 5/75-5/76 pre-post group)	
								1. Discharged	84
								2. Absent	29
"	"	"	"	263	186	77	29%	(data loss for 11/75-5/76 pre-post group)	
								1. Discharged	40
								2. Absent	37

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, Houghton Mifflin (IPMS) Level 1 etc.)

(3) Number of participants in the activity.

(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.

(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed.

(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

(7) For each reason specified, provide a separate number count.

APPENDIX C: PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The DSEPPS Supplementary Reading Program for the Handicapped, 1975-76, operated in 43 schools in the five boroughs of New York City from September 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976 with a staff of 38 full time teachers, one half-time teacher and two paraprofessionals. There were approximately 762 children associated with the Bureau for Children of Retarded Mental Development (CRMD) and 816 children associated with the Bureau for the Education of the Physically Handicapped (BEPH) serviced by the program.

Analyses of pretest-posttest scores on the Stanford Reading Achievement Test (Forms B and A, Primary 1 level) indicated highly statistically significant increases in mean reading grade level. These increases appeared attributable to small group instruction, to the quality of prescriptive instruction provided by the DSEPPS teachers (all of whom were licensed and trained in the area of special education), and to the cooperation and rapport established between the children's regular teachers and the rapport established between the children's regular teachers and the DSEPPS teachers.

Distributions generated from the California Prescriptive Reading Inventory pretest-posttest scores were separated by BEPH-CRMD classification and by test level. From these distributions it was determined that none of the groups reached a mastery level where 70 percent of the group achieved mastery of eight or more State Education Department instructional objectives. However, all of the groups did have a majority who did master instructional objectives which they had failed to master at the outset of the program. It was recommended on the basis of the evaluation that the program be continued.